

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 263 948

JC 850 598

AUTHOR Kintzer, Frederick C.
TITLE An Evaluation of a Data Base on Statewide
Articulation and Transfer Agreements. Sabbatical
Leave Report, Spring 1985.
INSTITUTION California Univ., Los Angeles. Graduate School of
Education
PUB DATE Sep 85
NOTE 37p.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Reports - Descriptive
(141)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Articulation (Education); *Community Colleges;
Educational Assessment; *Educational Trends;
*Intercollegiate Cooperation; Postsecondary
Education; *Statewide Planning; *Transfer Policy;
Transfer Programs

ABSTRACT

This report evaluates and expands a database on statewide articulation and transfer agreements, and provides an updated taxonomy of types of agreements. Initial sections outline the purpose and procedures of the articulation study. Next, a taxonomy of statewide agreements is presented for the years 1972, 1976, and 1985. The agreements are categorized as belonging to one of four types: formal and legally-based guidelines and policies; state system policies; voluntary agreements between institutions or within states; and states specializing in vocational-technical credit transfer. Following a historical overview of statewide articulation and transfer efforts, the paper presents summaries of developments in the following target states: Arizona, California, Florida, Hawaii, Illinois, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Washington, and Wyoming. Finally, concluding comments discuss the significance of the results. (LAL)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

F. KINTZER

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official NIE
position or policy.

AN EVALUATION OF A DATA BASE
ON STATEWIDE ARTICULATION AND TRANSFER AGREEMENTS

SABBATICAL LEAVE REPORT, SPRING 1985

Frederick C. Kintzer, Professor
Graduate School of Education

University of California, Los Angeles
September 1985

ED263948

JC 850 598

Purpose

The purpose of the research was to evaluate and expand a data base on statewide articulation and transfer agreements. "Articulation" refers to services provided students transferring from high schools-to community colleges-to universities and the reverse, and laterally throughout higher education. "Transfer" is course and credit equivalency exchanges. The investigation was a continuation of a two-decade research focus, including at this point, the refinement of a taxonomy of types of agreements, with explanations, comparisons, and directions.

Procedures

The initial responsibility was to complete the collection of statewide agreements, and following a review of these, to adjust a taxonomy of types developed first about 12 years ago. The original design contained 22 states where numbers of institutions and transfer students appeared to warrant uniform attention, or where innovative articulation and transfer activities statewide were being tried despite comparatively small numbers (see Table A).

Table A

Taxonomy - 1972

Formally & Legally Based Guidelines & Policies	State System Policies	Voluntary Agreements Between Institutions or Within Systems	Specializing in Vocational-Technical Credit Transfer
Florida Georgia Illinois Texas	Arizona Hawaii Iowa Kentucky Massachusetts Nevada New Jersey New York North Carolina Oklahoma Oregon Pennsylvania Virginia Washington Wisconsin	California Michigan	Indiana (Kintzer, 1972)

The 1972 taxonomy of 22 states had grown to 37 by 1976. Greatest gain was noted in the second category - State System Policies - as additional states found it necessary or expedient to develop statewide guidelines and/or policies on articulation and transfer. By the mid-1970s, few states had as yet gone beyond policies dealing with course and credit transfer. Transfer student services were absent (See Table B).

Table C
Taxonomy - 1985 Study

1	2	3	4
*Florida *Illinois Massachusetts Nevada Rhode Island South Carolina *Washington	*Arizona *Hawaii *Maryland *New Jersey *New York Oklahoma *Virginia Wyoming	*California *Pennsylvania	Michigan *North Carolina Ohio *Oregon (Kintzer, 1985)

In order to verify the preliminary analysis of materials from the target states, visits were scheduled with officials at 13 state capitals and at least one university and community college campus in each of the states. The states visited are asterisked in Table C. Intensive correspondence and telephone communications were continued with state and institutional officials in the other target states. In a later section, the status of articulation and transfer will be documented in those states showing greatest change.

Explanation of the Four Agreement Types
Identified in the Above Chart

1. Formal and Legally-Based Guidelines and Policies

These state documents have several common features:

- (1) Authorization or authority is traced to the state constitution, state legislation, education code, or master plan.
- (2) Articulation services are included, (3) Completion of the associate degree is the basic qualification for transfer, although credits for individual courses are usually acceptable,
- (4) General education requirements prescribed in the degree completion packages are presented in detail.

2. State System Policies

Documents from these states tend: (1) to emphasize credit transfer, (2) show less attention, in the aggregate, to articulation services, (3) to place responsibility in a state official, often in an office of the university system, and (4) to invest substantial power in the responsible agency.

3. Voluntary Agreements Between Institutions or Within States

The target states identified in Table C do not have statewide policies on articulation and transfer. About half of the 50 states are included in this category. Decisions in these states are reached as transfer cases arise, rather than from a point of law or a quasi-legal base. In some states, the small numbers of sending and receiving institutions generate comparatively few transfer applicants, thus postponing the necessity for formalizing agreements.

4. States Specializing in Vocational-Technical Credit Transfer

Special attention to this interchange in addition to or in lieu of traditional academic transfer is given in the several states listed in Table C. The latest of these are emerging as four-year programs, tying together the final two Tech Prep years in high schools and the Associate Degree years in two-year colleges. These arrangements are in addition to the long-standing technical institute/senior college-university baccalaureate packages.

Multiple types of statewide agreements are actually practiced in many states. Several of the most transfer-productive states should be so-listed. For example, the California State University System maintains a flexible arrangement with the state's community colleges. Authorized by a systemwide executive order, community colleges have the right to name transfer courses (column 2 in the Tables). In contrast, the University of California continues a system of individual transfer agreements covered by general guidelines (column 1 in the Tables). In Illinois, the "Baccalaureate Compact" dating from 1970 is still used by virtually all junior and senior institutions, but in recent years, 2 + 2 year agreements (both high school/community college terminal and community college/university academic) have become popular. Illinois should therefore be listed in both columns 1 and 2. A similar situation is found in Michigan, where by legislative action in 1984, the eight universities and colleges initiated degree structures to accommodate community college vocational-technical programs.

Variations especially in states listed in column 2 should also be noted. In New York, for example, the SUNY and CUNY higher education systems consisting of junior and senior institutions maintain separate and distinct relationships, primarily transfer rather than articulation, among the constituencies.

Shifts in the taxonomic groupings will be explained in the state-by-state summaries, together with directions predicted for statewide articulation and transfer.

Background Summary of Statewide Articulation and Transfer

Interinstitutional credit transfer has been in effect from the beginning of the junior college movement. For several decades, however, these arrangements remained informal. For the most part, practices were individualized. The fate of transfer students depended on separate action taken by registrars and directors of admission. Despite the rapid growth of two-year colleges, systematic planning and policy making lagged, particularly at the state level.

The lack of attention given articulation and transfer characterized the early state master plans that included community college education. Nineteen plans analyzed by Hurlburt dating from the California Master Plan for Higher Education, 1960, noted an absence of transfer policies. Hurlburt concluded that two- and four-year transfer information was an institutional rather than a statewide matter.

More recent state master plans have shown interest - major interest in several cases - in providing philosophical discussions in recognition of the problems faced by transfers, and recommendations to correct conditions of unequal treatment, even penalty, against transfers. State plans developed in New Jersey (1970), New York-SUNY (1972), Maryland (1973), Connecticut (1974), Kansas and Oklahoma (1975), and South Carolina (1979) recognized, in varying degrees, the value of statewide policy on articulation and transfer.

Developments in four states set the stage for greater statewide activities in the 1970s. In 1965 the Florida State Board of Education, after 10 years of negotiating, including subject matter joint committees, approved an agreement guaranteeing transfer student acceptance by campuses of the university system. The same year, the Illinois General Assembly passed the Junior College Act that included articulation procedures. A statement in the 1964 Provisional Master Plan for Higher Education in Illinois provided impetus for the Act that in turn established the legal base upon which to build a comprehensive articulation plan.

In both Florida and Illinois, however, agreements were not in consistent use until 1971. In that year, the Florida Formal Agreement Plan first approved in 1965 was updated and reconfirmed. The Illinois Legally Based Plan was adopted by the Board of Higher Education on June 1 of that year.

During the same period, a third state, Georgia, was making progress toward a core curriculum formula. Initially effective in all institutions of the university system, including junior colleges, by the 1969 fall term, the 90 quarter hour core provided transfer students equal opportunity to graduate with the same total credits as university native students.

Other states issued policy statements under a variety of auspices in the 1970s. The New Jersey Full-Faith-and-Credit Policy (1973), The Massachusetts Commonwealth Transfer

Compact (1974), The Nevada University System Articulation Policy (1974), and the Oklahoma Articulation Plan (1975). Rhode Island and Washington have recently joined the group.

A transfer guide released by the Rhode Island Board of Regents in April 1980 contains specific transfer policies and articulation recommendations. In Washington, a policy on inter-college transfer was announced in December 1984. Prepared in response to 1983 legislation requiring a statewide credit transfer agreement, this document incorporates a review and appeal system for resolving interinstitutional transfer disputes. The general education/associate degree requirements in force since 1983 are probably the strongest in any state.

At the present time, about two-thirds of the states have policy statements on articulation and transfer that encompass major segments of higher education. In only 10 is all of higher education affected.

Summary Developments in the Major Target States

Arizona

Arizona was one of the first states to publish a Higher Education Equivalency Guide. Introduced initially at the first annual University-Community College Conference in 1974, the Guide has undergone continuous adjustments as new equivalencies are negotiated.

An upsurge of activity has occurred in the last two years. Under the impetus of a four-state project coordinated by the Western Interstate Commission of Higher Education (WICHE), single discipline articulation task forces have been appointed to work out agreements. Twenty one disciplines have been selected for 1985-86. A handbook for the task forces could serve as a model for other states.

Membership on the statewide Articulation Steering Committee is equally divided between the community college and university systems. Five sub-committees have been named, i.e., college curriculum, college articulation, interdisciplinary articulation departmental articulation, and transition courses. An exchange of university and community college faculties has been developed. Community colleges offer upper division courses in a few major areas. A six-month warning on new courses offered by either system has been initiated. A degree audit system, including computerized advising and graduation verification, has also been developed.

Among the long range objectives is the development of a standard definition of "transfer student." The achievement of this goal has far-reaching significance beyond the State of Arizona.

California

Differences in approaches to the articulation and transfer relationships in the two California senior higher education systems have been described in an earlier section: The University of California's individual agreement system covered by general guidelines, and the State University's arrangement with community colleges that name their own transfer course. Attention in this summary section will be given to several recent developments sponsored by statewide organizations and the legislature. A statement on the Articulation Council of California will conclude the section.

California Postsecondary Education Commission

The year 1984-85 was declared "The Year of the Transfer Function" by the Postsecondary Education Commission. This action appears to be symptomatic of an emerging nationwide priority.

Since 1980, a number of important studies have been

completed by the Research Division. These include at least three updates of community college transfer student statistics, a report on common numbering systems, and a significant series of staff papers on "Missions and Functions of the California Community Colleges." The work of the Ad Hoc Committee on Community College Transfer initiated by the Commission may be a catalyst for widespread efforts to understand and assess transfer education. Among its goals, the Committee is considering recommendations to improve the flow of community college transfers through university degree programs. Reaffirming California's Commitment to Transfer contains a series of recommendations to improve student transfer.

California Community Colleges

An emphasis on transfer was also announced by the California Community College State Board of Governors. The work of the Analytical Studies unit is strategic in the statewide buildup. In particular, the document, Transfer Education, prepared by the Unit, is a thorough and detailed examination of transfer activity, including number rates, intercollege differences, and transfer student performance.

A formula developed for assessing transfer numbers, a statistical regression model permitting analyses of the impact on transfer numbers of certain variables, should assist research units in other states now initiating transfer research. The regression model permits analyses of the impact on transfer numbers on certain variables, e.g.,

university admissions policies, the military draft.

Investigation in a number of areas representing gaps in knowledge is a further contribution, calling attention to unstudied questions in articulation as well as transfer.

California Round Table on Educational Opportunity

Academic curriculum planning partnerships, as noted elsewhere in vocational-technical education, are growing in popularity. An example of such coordinate effort was recently released by The California Round Table on Educational Opportunity. A document prepared by statewide Academic Senate representatives of the three public higher education segments stipulates competencies expected of entering college freshmen in English and Mathematics. The statement is intended to assist junior and senior high school teachers in curriculum development, with the ultimate purpose of preparing students for a successful collegiate experience in these basic disciplines. Similar statements in other academic areas, e.g., Sciences and Fine Arts, are in preparation.

State Legislation

The State Legislature has also been active in promoting intersegmental relations. The California Academic Partnership Program was created by statute in 1983. Proposals funded in the two-year period are designed to improve the quality of education through measurable outcomes. All involve linkages among and between public school districts, community colleges, and universities. Activities include writing projects, diagnostic testing, and mathematics and sciences

sequences. Key groups are student affairs officers, counselors, and faculty.

Transfer centers have also been designated through state funding. Regional units composed of representatives of the tripartite higher education systems will work to improve access for transfer students and quality of their lower division education and services.

Articulation Council of California

The Articulation Council is a voluntary nonprofit group that has been operating for over 60 years. Membership on the Board of Directors is equal among the participating segments, as is membership on the various liaison committees. Council members from the tripartite higher education systems, public schools, and independent institutions meet annually. Much of the schedule is given to two-way discussions on issues and procedural matters. Student participation on liaison committees is permitted, and some committees have chosen to add student members.

The work of the committees and the Board is concerned with easing the flow of students. The primary vehicle for this is through decisions on issues reached by liaison committees. The Council is nongovernmental, voluntary, and self-regulating. It was the first statewide organization created to monitor articulation and transfer.

Florida

The Florida Formal Agreement Plan, as previously mentioned, was the first statewide agreement on general education requirements at the lower division. Approved by the State Board of Education in 1965 and reconfirmed in 1971, the pact was based on the belief that transfer should be accomplished without administrative interference, and that protection of the integrity of institutions was paramount. The notion of institutional primacy in establishing and applying transfer policies and practices affecting itinerant students remains a basic premise, as state government improves its position in the struggle for control of articulation and transfer. Third party assistance from the state in support of unilateral action of institutions and coordination among several, would include state-arranged opportunities for interinstitutional negotiation, legitimating forthcoming policies, developing assessment instruments, evaluating results, exchanging information, and funding experimental arrangements.

Four developments in Florida have significantly changed the original plan: (1) statewide common course numbering system, (2) a common calendar, (3) the adoption of the College-level Academic Skills Test, and (4) a common entry test that became effective early in 1985.

Common Course Numbering System

Florida's common course numbering system was authorized by state legislation soon after the general education

agreement was established. By 1983, over 150 subject areas and about 55,000 courses had been included. The objectives of the system were to facilitate course and credit transfer, to reduce detailed transfer decisions by counselors and administrative officers, and to prevent needless repetition of courses. Continuous updating and evaluation of the system is a major complication and expense, particularly as the state higher education grows. Nevertheless, common numbering systems and alternative plans are being discussed in many states.

Common Academic Calendar

All Florida universities and community colleges were placed on the same academic calendar in February 1980 by the State Board of Education. The system is administered by an agency within the staff of the State Board of Education.

The College-Level Academic Skills Test and Common Entry Testing

The College-Level Academic Skills Test, an achievement test developed by the Department of Education designed to measure college-level communication and computation skills, was developed for use in universities and community colleges beginning October 1982. The test has been scored and normative data developed. Cut-off scores have been established (roughly 50 percent correct answers). Those who pass three of the four sections of CLAST may enroll in up to 36 credit hours in upper-division before having to pass the fourth section. The non-passers will not be permitted to

continue in a Florida public university. The common entry tests may be repeated until passed.

In an effort to avoid heavy student failure, institutions are giving prep classes, individual tutoring, and providing self-study workbooks. Tougher passing standards are predicted as the state attempts to force the strengthening of high school and community college courses, as well as career counseling. Opponents of the state plan question the reasoning behind the testing program, questioning the long-term values of forced learning and the validity of the tests, themselves.

Hawaii

Hawaii is one of four states where all public two-year colleges belong to the University system (Alaska, Hawaii, Kentucky, and Nevada). The seven community colleges are comprehensive. The eighth unit, the Employment Training Office headquartered in Honolulu, offers only on-site job training programs on all the Islands. Six of the seven comprehensive colleges are under the Chancellor for Community Colleges. The seventh Hawaii Community College is administered by a provost who reports directly to the Chancellor of the University at Hilo. This situation tends to weaken the Community College Chancellor's position, and breaks the unity of the system.

The two-year colleges were brought into the system in 1964 when a change of jurisdiction over the four technical schools was authorized, from the Department of Education

to the University of Hawaii. Later, the fifth technical institute became Hawaii Community College operated from the new Hilo campus of the University.

The seven community colleges enroll about 53 percent of the total undergraduate population, and 57 percent are part-time. Characteristic of many community college systems, half of the students are declared technical/vocational education majors. Entrance to a University campus directly from high school includes a precise course pattern. Community college admission is open.

While the seven colleges are referred to as totally integrated with the University campuses, the system does not have a transfer policy. A course-by-course evaluation still prevails. An Associate in Arts degree transfer option reported in my 1976 book has not been adopted. The proposal permitting completion of all baccalaureate general education requirements was adopted by the Hilo University campus faculty, but not at Manoa.

The Manoa campus general education requirement series is one of the most severe in the country, i.e., 66 credit core in Arts and Sciences. In lieu of a detailed arrangement, the Manoa campus faculty has agreed to avoid adding courses in discreet subject areas, e.g., "World Civilization," and in turn, the community colleges would not add new core transfer courses. The Community College Chancellor certifies all courses submitted by the colleges for core acceptance. An all-college curriculum committee

reviews new course applications and forwards its recommendations to the Chancellor.

The Chancellor for Community Colleges, housed adjacent to the Manoa campus of the University, reports to the University President. Two directors (Administrative Affairs and Academic Affairs) report to the Chancellor. The latter administrator is responsible for research. The research office identifies a transfer student as one whose most recent course was taken at a community college. That definition encompasses a wide variety of students, including those who have not graduated from high school as well as some university enrollees. About 900 move annually to university campuses from community colleges, and about 700 are reverse transfers.

The two university campuses still offer several career-type degree programs, including Industrial Arts and Nursing. These are integrated throughout the system, suggesting that declared majors move without credit loss from community colleges to the university campuses.

Private colleges, e.g., Chaminade University of Hawaii and Hawaii Pacific College, have shown strong interest in community college graduates, aggressively seeking them for upper division majors. The Manoa University campus remains the most popular choice for transfers.

Illinois

For two decades, Illinois has been actively involved in articulation and transfer. Rapid growth in community college education prompted the "Baccalaureate Articulation Compact" in the early 1970s. By 1976, virtually all two- and four-year institutions had endorsed the document at least in principle. The compact required that A.A. degree graduates be accepted as juniors at public universities, and guaranteed graduation after two more years in the same program. Although the proposal was tabled for two-years of study largely on the urging of the University, considerable progress has recently been made to strengthen its implementation.

While the compact is still observed, community colleges are now favoring 2 + 2 occupational-type agreements individually arranged with senior institutions. These are similar to the 2 + 2 tech prep/associate degree agreements gaining popularity throughout the Mid-West.

Illinois has taken leadership in resolving difficult subject transfer problems that persist across the country in Business Education. The major difficulty arises from one of the standards of the American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business that recommends concentration of professional courses in business only in the upper division, and limited work in the lower division. This obviously limits the participation of two-year colleges. As indicated in a recent Board of Higher Education report, Illinois universities

now review community college course outlines and offer substitute course lists to add flexibility to the credit transfer process. Although this procedure may appear to be a step backward, it is actually a logical first step in solving a difficult and persistent problem.

The State Community College Board was instrumental in persuading both public and private institutions to appoint articulation coordinators with decision making authority. The first state agency to start that type of association, the transfer coordinators meet several times a year to review the status of articulation and transfer. The Directory of Transfer Coordinators of Illinois Colleges and Universities is the only publication of its type.

John Wood Community College, one of the state's public two-year colleges, has announced a "credit transfer money back guarantee." Beginning Fall 1985, the college will refund tuition for courses taken in good faith, but resulting in non-acceptance at a senior institution. Increasing competition is one of the compelling factors in this marketing technique. Implementing the plan, however, does require close association between counselors and students and continuing communication between sending and receiving institutions.

Massachusetts

As indicated earlier, the Massachusetts Commonwealth Transfer Compact was one of the early influential statewide agreements.

The basis for the compact is the acceptance of A.A. degree programs that contain the equivalent of 60 hours of undergraduate college-level study. The document makes reference to the degree acceptance as one small step toward a total agreement that would eventually include policies on the transfer of individual courses or packages prior to degree completion. Community colleges are allowed to determine placement of transfer courses in English, Social Science, Mathematics/Sciences, and Fine Arts. For example, Business Mathematics could apply toward the Mathematics requirement, and Speech toward the Humanities group.

The revised compact completed in 1984 includes several important changes. The new document provides for a Transfer Coordinating Committee, requires the appointment of a transfer officer at every institution, and recognizes the allocation of space for all transfer students. The revision distinguishes between the A.A. and A.S. degrees, the latter places greater emphasis on scientific, mathematical and technical competencies. Model transfer programs in Business Administration and Engineering have also been developed. Completion of the Associate Degree, however, remains the fundamental requirement.

Program integration with distinctions between the two associate degrees and provisions for strengthening coordination, information exchange, and transfer services are advantages found in the revised compact.

New Jersey

The 1973 New Jersey Full-Faith-and-Credit Policy was amended in 1981 to require state college baccalaureate general education requirements to constitute about half of the degree. These requirements would be spread over the arts and sciences. Community colleges were also required to spread general education courses across arts and sciences disciplines. The policy amendments limited state colleges from adding more than 68 credits for the baccalaureate beyond the maximum units transferred from graduates of county (community) colleges.

All associate degree credits were again asserted to be acceptable toward state college baccalaureates, but the state colleges may require more general education up to the maximum 68 units. These exchanges continue without great disruption, but applications toward major field baccalaureates and professional degrees are negotiated on an individual basis.

The 1981 policy amendment also included an urgent request of Rutgers University and New Jersey Institute of Technology to adopt the measures, but some of the faculties of these institutions continue a course-by-course evaluation.

Concerning non-graduates of community colleges who have sufficient credits but not a specific course(s), the amended policy asks that the transfers be treated as graduates, provided the missing course(s) is not a requirement of the receiving state college.

Another policy guarantee has implications for technical education majors. When a state college establishes a program that accepts transfers from non-approved curriculums, county college transfer students are then guaranteed enrollment under the same conditions as if they had graduated in an approved transfer program. This flexibility should encourage additional county college students to continue advanced studies at the state college level.

The same number of transfers move annually into the state college system as to the three campuses of Rutgers University. The number - about 3400 - has remained constant since 1980. Independent senior colleges and universities also average approximately 3300 transfers per year.

The total number of annual transfers is 9000 to 9500, between 10 and 11 percent of all credit students enrolled in the New Jersey county(communit)ycollege system. This is somewhat above the average for the major community college states.

Thomas A. Edison State College

Particular attention was given in this investigation to Edison State College because of its unique character. Opened 13 years ago as an external degree institution, the operational plan was patterned after the SUNY Regents External Degree program. One of the most prominent specialites continues to be college credit by portfolio assessment. Last year, 1984-85, almost 15 percent of all credits awarded were earned through portfolio assessment. Over 30 percent

of the state college's 4500 students were given credit for prior learning through the complex evaluation procedure. As a transfer receiving institution, 58 percent of all credits awarded last year by Edison State were transferred into a degree program.

While the experiential learning route toward degree credit is still very strong, college leaders envision developing what is called "directed study" - simulated classrooms with faculty monitoring and video and other electronic mailing components housed in various sections of the country. They further consider cooperative association with the "Electronic College," an organization headquartered in San Francisco. A series of "generic courses" is now available through the "Electronic College." Senior institutions across the country are beginning to accept completion of these courses without placement testing. The "generic courses" are often purchased by institutions, and refinanced through student fees. Complete degrees are not as yet available, but this is anticipated.

Lessening interest in degree credit for experiential/prior learning is due, in part, to the developing sophistication of computer technology, as applied to curriculum development and delivery systems.

New York

The State of New York has three independently operated and governed systems of higher education: The State University of New York (SUNY), The City University of New York (CUNY), and the Commission of Private Colleges and Universities. Both public systems have a variety of comprehensive and specialized postsecondary institutions. SUNY is scattered throughout the state away from New York City (except for The Fashion Institute of Technology located in the City), and CUNY is confined to New York City.

SUNY

The State University Board of Trustees adopted a transfer policy resolution in 1980 reaffirming and strengthening its original 1972 position. Two-year college graduates are assured full junior standing with opportunity to complete a baccalaureate within four more semesters of full-time work. The 1980 reaffirmation gives full power to the presidents of the colleges to negotiate problems.

Many SUNY two-year colleges have 2 + 2 academic transfer contracts with SUNY senior colleges, and transfer booklets are increasingly popular as joint enterprises. Joint admissions programs are also being established. The 1986 SUNY application, a form used by all institutions, carries a formal application for approved joint admissions. The existing agreements include sections on articulation services, e.g., academic advisement, special information services.

A competent and energetic central SUNY staff is conducting a variety of research projects on transfer, and in general, urging the extension of cooperative efforts to improve student exchange.

CUNY

The City University of New York, a much older organization, has had a transfer policy since 1974. The central office maintains a comprehensive course equivalency guide. A recent addition to the system policy grants full transfer of all community college Arts and Science courses. At least 9 units must apply to the B. A. major in a CUNY university. CUNY colleges and universities are heavily involved with high schools through the City Board of Education.

The State of New York, through its several independent systems, strongly emphasizes transfer - to increase options and structural flexibility. The extensive Regents External Degree Program at both the associate and baccalaureate levels, based on New York's College Proficiency Examination Program is the nation's leader in independent study and external learning.

North Carolina

Significant progress in increasing and improving options for transfer students continues in North Carolina. The state first gained national recognition for policies on general education and vocational-technical transfer developed in the early 1970s.

On the academic side, the University system has taken leadership , as mandated by the General Statutes of the State. The General Administration provides the services of the Vice-President of Student Services and Special Programs as professional staff to the statewide joint committee and is responsible for publications on transfer. Special reports on transfer policies of senior colleges and universities released annually are among the most complete references found anywhere. Increasing interest in articulation is also noted. The Vice-President of Student Services has recently released a third compendium of papers by student services officers of the several University campuses. These publications are helping to improve communication with community colleges and technical institutes.

On vocational-technical transfer, North Carolina first gained prominence through the Allied Health Articualtion Project that provided opportunities to combine vocational and general curricula. While progress is slow in gaining senior college support, particularly for general education courses offered by technical institutes, a statewide committee monitoring progress, continues to urge acceptance. Interinstitutional agreements resulting from the allied health project now serve as models for the rest of the nation.

North Carolina was a strategic state for this study because both community colleges and technical institutes could be involved. The fact that both types offer technical

degrees and certificates was a complication but a convenient environment for research. Another unusual feature was the Bachelor of Technology degree offered at two senior institutions that provided potential for programmatic exchanges between the two and four-year schools.

The Department of Community Colleges of the State Board of Education continues to urge a variety of arrangements between elementary and secondary education and two-year colleges and institutes.

Oklahoma

Two unusual policies have recently been added to the Oklahoma Plan that was first made operational in 1977. Senior institutions may require additional general education to graduate. This work must be in upper-division courses to assure completion of the B.A. degree. In other words, transfer students cannot be delayed because of "hidden" general education requirements. In a second provision, courses classified as junior-level yet open to sophomores at senior institutions even though taught at a two-year college as sophomore-level courses, are transferrable as satisfying that part of the content area requirement.

The fact that certain courses taught in two-year colleges of Oklahoma are acceptable for upper division credit is a major breakthrough for community college education. The provision is a partial answer to a basic question: Does the faculty of a two-year college have integrity

in terms of degree application of courses? The answer appears to be affirmative in Oklahoma.

Oregon

The community college system in Oregon is as free from state control as any other state. The college districts control governance, and are truly local service area institutions. Financing is only one-third state and over 40 percent local. However, the freedom of local control and support is problematic. Competition for local monies is severe, and districts must seek levy increases every year. The state is not able to improve its support level significantly. Proposition 13 type legislation narrowly missed in 1984. Local administrators and boards fear that limiting legislation may be successful.

The Office of Community College Services in the Department of Education monitors community college transfer courses. The publication: Lower Division Collegiate Courses, contains a common numbering system for two-year colleges, but not for the universities. The state office is now attempting to get agreements on regional course common numbering. Some vocational-technical courses are found in the book, but only those associated with B.A. degrees, e.g., computer asistants, and drafting. Transfer is not necessarily associated with the A.A. degree.

A second publication: Transfer Programs, maintained by the State System of Higher Education, carries recommended programs for transfer students. Course sequences are tied

to the Lower Division Guide.

Community colleges submit course lists to the Office of Community College Services and transfer status is negotiated. Any course so-approved is given full transfer status in the Lower Division Guide. Although the State Department does give final approval, state control of community college curriculum is minimal.

Pennsylvania

Two documents on transfer were released by the Pennsylvania Department of Higher Education in 1973: a statement calling for preference to be given A.A. degree graduates when applying for admission to a state college or university, and an articulation model for the state that included a general education transfer package. Unfortunately, neither document is being followed. The state colleges, in particular, are not cooperating. Since the state college system is legally permitted to offer associate degrees, the campuses compete heavily and openly for high school graduates. Legislation further prohibits granting the doctorate. The major growth level is therefore at the associate level.

Although associate degree-granting permission is also extended to Pennsylvania State University, the University campuses are much more cooperative with community colleges. The Capitol Center Campus, an upper-level university, is especially eager to attract two-year college graduates. Private universities, particularly Temple and Pitt,

also encourage community college transfers. However, the state still does not have a coordinated policy for facilitating transfer.

The Commission for Community Colleges, composed of the executives and board members of the state's two-year colleges, employ a full-time executive director whose primary responsibility is improving transfer relations. A proposal on "The Advanced Admission of Community college Students to State College Programs" was adopted by the Commission two year ago, but again, this recommendation is not being followed.

Washington

For more than a decade the State of Washington has had an interinstitutional committee on articulation and transfer. The first set of transfer guidelines released by the Inter-College Relations Commission in 1971 and subsequent editions, provided the basis for academic course agreements with senior colleges, but only peripherally with the University of Washington and the State University. Legislation passed in 1983 mandated action, and a year later, an inter-college transfer agreement was announced. All public and private institutions, including the major universities, have now bought into the agreement. Individual community college/university agreements no longer exist.

Associate in Arts degree packages have resulted. vocational-technical course transfer is left to individual

institutions. The general education requirements in the packages are comparatively comprehensive. A quantitative skills requirement is likely by 1987.

The statewide agreement focuses on degree completion. However, the document does recommend the transfer of similar numerical values for acceptable courses. Packages may also contain courses that are normally not individually transferable. Course content flexibility is extended institutions. Articulation services are not addressed except for sections on better information exchange and student rights and responsibilities.

Wyoming

Wyoming's first course transfer guide was published in 1981. With seven separately-governed community colleges sending over 500 students annually to the University of Wyoming, the only baccalaureate and graduate degree-granting institution, a comprehensive statement on equivalencies was feasible. In addition to usual policy statements on acceptance of "appropriate" and "parallel" community college courses at the lower-division level, two flexible features were included: (1) to accommodate those who have taken two-year college courses offered in upper-division through substitutions in the major or by examination credit, and (2) to permit transfer of courses not found in the Guide when applicable to a particular curriculum.

The University has also established a computer linkage program with community colleges that includes a graduation check for off-campus degree candidates.

Significance and Dispersion of Results

Renewed interest in transfer education is apparent, especially by state governments in the key states identified. Public institutions, in particular, are noting increasing pressure from legislatures. The diminishing number of traditional age cohorts, together with the rise of transfer groups heretofore not served encourage interinstitutional competition.

Recent evidence of decreasing success and high retention rates of transfer students continues in prominent discussion. In California, The Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) has referred to 1984-85 as "The Year of the Transfer Function" to urge community colleges to work on the improvement of that function and to encourage cooperative planning with high schools and universities. A recent report entitled "Reaffirming California's Commitment to Transfer," includes specific recommendations to the state's public postsecondary institutions on how best to facilitate the transfer responsibility. A qualifying examination for higher education admission mandated by the Florida state legislature adds a strident note to the national situation, and a sense of urgency to my work.

Demands for state executives and legislators to take immediate action are placing public schools and colleges on the defensive, driving some to early and premature decisions. Improved practice based on systematic research is urgently needed.

FCK
9/85

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE
FOR JUNIOR COLLEGES
JAN 24 1986
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX